



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,553	10/18/2000	Michael G. Coutts	8573.00	3877
26889	7590	03/20/2007	EXAMINER	
MICHAEL CHAN NCR CORPORATION 1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD DAYTON, OH 45479-0001			PATEL, HARESH N	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/691,553	COUTTS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 39-47 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 39-47 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 39-47 are subject to examination. Claims 1-38 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Response to Amendment

3. The amendment filed 1/8/2007 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

- a. addition of limitations, On page 19, line 10, after "...on behalf of the applet 260." i.e., "Figure 14 illustrates processes undertaken by one form of the invention. The process begins at block 300, wherein a user initiates a transaction at a self-service terminal, SST. In block 303, the SST presents an option to the user to gain access to a third party application. The airline information discussed above provides an example of the third party information. In block 306, the user exercises the option. In block 309, the third party application requests permission from the SST to use a peripheral, such as a printer. In block 312, an application at the SST makes a decision on whether to allow the third party application to use the peripheral. In block 315, the peripheral is actuated, but under control of an application in the SST. Significantly, control of the peripheral is not given

to the third party application, as block 318 indicates. In block 321, the peripheral performs the service requested by the third party application". (Note: In block 303, the SST cannot itself (hardware) present an option to the user, without utilizing the SST terminal application. In block 306, the user exercises the option, but the terminal application of the SSP is not used to support the option. In block 309, the third party application cannot request permission from the SST itself (hardware), without utilizing the SST terminal application. In block 312, an application at the SST makes a decision, but this application ("an application") not being "terminal application" or under control of the "terminal application" is contrary to allow other application including third party application or this application to make the decision. In block 315, the peripheral cannot be actuated under control of an application in the SST, without utilizing the same SST terminal application as this application ("an application") not being "terminal application" or under control of the "terminal application" is contrary to the terminal application having all the control. In block 321, the peripheral performs the service requested by the third party application, is missing who is transferring the service for the delivery). The page 8, of the remarks dated 3/27/2007 states, "In contrast, in the present application, control of the peripherals is never allowed to pass to any third party application", then another application (not the terminal application) in block 312, i.e., an application (not the terminal application) at the SST makes a decision on whether to allow the third party application to use the peripheral, is also in fact contrary because the another application (not the terminal application) in block 312 has the control rather the terminal application and when the control of the peripherals is never allowed to pass, the

decision result (two possibilities) contracts with the control of the peripherals that is not passed.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter, to avoid abandonment of this application, in the reply to this Office Action.

Drawings

4. The figure 14 submitted on 1/8/2007 is objected to. New corrected drawings are required in this application because Figure 14 does not show usage of user input device (presented in the claimed invention) that is controlled by the terminal application, two result flows after step 312 that decides whether to grant request, i.e., what happens when the request is not granted, how the application of 312 is related to the SST terminal application, step 303 which application is presenting the option, step 306 which application supports the exercising of the option, which application is receiving request at step 309, which application prevents passing control to the third party application at step 318, missing step after only activating the peripheral by the terminal application, who is continuing to support the service / data / transfer /information to the peripheral for the user. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled --Replacement Sheet-- in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. The claim 42 and its dependent claims contain a controller for implementing steps that does not provide concrete and tangible result. Activating alone is not producing a tangible result. Further, the outcome of the determining is not utilized and the activating itself does not provide service to the user, which enables any usefulness of having done the activating to be realized (please see the claimed subject matter of claim 42, it is missing a step of providing the service to the user either by the terminal application or the third party application). The terminal application and the third party application being software elements are not stored in a computer storage medium such as memory. Similar applies to claims 39, 45 and their dependent claims. Further, claim 45 does not contain the third party application being software element stored in a computer storage medium such as memory. (please see the claimed subject matter of claim 45, it is also missing a step of presenting the information to the user either by the terminal application or the third party application).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 42 recite the limitations, “the user accessing the third party application to obtain a service”, however, claim 44 further defines that the peripheral device includes a display device, which is not possible.

Claim 45 recite the limitations, “peripheral device for presenting information to the user”, however, claim 46 further defines that the peripheral device includes a user input device, which is not possible.

Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Usage of user input device peripheral device to support the user accessing the third part application, Usage of same terminal application to carryout receiving etc steps and handling of all peripheral devices by the same terminal application only to accomplish the claimed terminal application to control the peripheral devices (that precludes control of other applications) is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Without usage of user input device peripheral device, the user cannot by himself/herself do the accessing to the third part application. Without using a same terminal application to carryout receiving etc steps and handling of all peripheral devices by the same

terminal application only, it is not possible to have the claimed terminal application to have control the peripheral devices (and that precludes other applications from direct interacting instructions to the peripheral device).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 39-47 recite the limitations, “a terminal application controls the peripheral device”, “the third party application to use the peripheral device”, fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). For clarification, when the third party application uses the peripheral device, the peripheral device has to perform according to the instructions/information provided by the third party application, for example, to carry out a transaction as per the third party application's instructions, a printer when to print and when to stop, etc. Hence, the third party application also has the control during the use of the peripheral device. The claimed invention fails to define what limited “use” is allowed to the third party application that cannot include any controlling to the peripheral device during the use of the peripheral device. Further, no “third party” exists in the presented claimed invention and in fact the third party application is part of the SST rather the third party, and hence, the third party application is similar to other applications of the SST that provide terminal services to the users including presenting information to the user and

allowing the user to access. Further, the user accesses the third party application directly for request (the claimed terminal application has no control during the accessing). All applications supported by the SST applications are terminal applications because the SST means terminal.

Claims 39-47 recite the limitations, “the third party application”, fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). The claimed invention fails to define why the third party application is not considered to be a terminal application because the third party application is also part of the claimed same self-service terminal (SST) and since the user of the SST is accessing the third party application for the service, the third party application interacts with the user using the SST and hence provides terminal services. The claimed does not provide which application supports “presenting”, “receiving a request” etc., meaning any of the applications of the SST perform the “presenting”, “receiving a request” etc. and has control for the “presenting”, “receiving a request”, etc. Further, since the user is accessing the third party application to obtain service, hence the user is inputting request and usage of a peripheral (input device) is must to make the request (even though not explicitly presented in the claims), which the third party application directly supports for the interaction during the request without usage of the claimed terminal application.

Claims 39 and 45 recite the limitations, “thereby”, which fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d).

Claims 39-47 recite the limitations, “control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application when the request from the third party application to use the peripheral

device is granted, and thereby to allow the user to obtain the service via the peripheral device”, fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). When the third party application uses the peripheral device, the peripheral device has to perform according to the instructions/information provided by the third party application, for example, to carry out a transaction as per the third party application’s instructions, a printer when to print, linefeed and when to stop, etc. Hence, the third party application also has the control due to the use of the peripheral device. The claimed invention fails to define what limited “use” is allowed to the third party application that cannot include any controlling to the peripheral device during the use and when the user is obtaining the service from the third party application via the peripheral device. Further, no “third party” exists in the claim and in fact the third party application is part of the SST rather the third party, and hence, the third party application is similar to other applications of the SST that provide terminal services to the users.

Claim 42 recites the limitation “the peripheral devices”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim (Please see MPEP 706.03(d)).

Claim 42 recite the limitations, “the peripheral device”, which fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). Since, multiple peripheral devices exist in the claim it is not clear which peripheral device is referred to.

Claim 45 recite the limitations, “a request from a third party application to use the peripheral device to present third party information to the user, ..., using the peripheral device under control of the terminal application, ..., control of the peripheral device is not passed to the

third part application at any time to present the user with the third party information, ..., and thereby to fulfill the request ", which fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim as per MPEP rules and guidelines, MPEP 706.03(d). The request is "to use the peripheral device to present third party information". How is the request fulfilled? Also, there is no step for presenting information either by the third party application or the terminal application. Similar applies to claim 39 and 42, as there is no providing service step to the user either by the third party application or the terminal application.

The term "different" in claim 45 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. As per the claimed invention presented in the claims, both the applications are part of the SST and hence, both are terminal applications.

The term "third party" in claim 39-47 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. As per the claimed invention presented in the claims, there is no third party and both the applications are part of the SST and hence, both are terminal applications. Both the applications present information to the user using the same peripheral device, e.g., display see claims. Further, multiple applications of the SST, for example, different applications related to handling of different financial institutions also deal with third party however considered as SST applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ramachandran et al., 6,023,688, Diebold, Incorporated (Hereinafter Ramachandran-Diebold).

10. Referring to claims 39, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses a method of operating a self-service terminal having a number of peripheral devices and a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14) the method comprising the steps of:

presenting to a self-service terminal user an option of accessing a third party application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14); receiving a request from the third party application to use one of the peripheral devices of the self-service terminal in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain the service from the third party application (e.g., col., 7, lines 8 – col., 64); using the terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party application should be granted (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14); and activating the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application when the request from the third party application to use the peripheral device is granted, and thereby to allow the user to obtain the service via the peripheral device (e.g., col., 14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

11. Referring to claim 40, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD also discloses monitoring terminal usage during operation of the third party application to ensure that the user is still present (e.g., col., 14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

12. Referring to claim 41, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD also discloses sending a response to the third party application to indicate the status of the request received from the third party application (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

13. Referring to claim 42, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a peripheral device; a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices; and a controller (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14) for (i) receiving a request from a third party application to use the peripheral device in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal, (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14) (ii) using the terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party application should be granted, (e.g., col., 7, lines 8 – col., 64); and (iii) activating the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time (e.g., col., 14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

14. Referring to claim 43, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a user input device (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

15. Referring to claim 44, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

16. Referring to claim 45, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a cash dispenser for dispensing cash to a self-service terminal user conducting a self-service cash dispensing transaction (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14); a peripheral device for presenting information to the user; a memory storing a terminal application which controls the peripheral device; and a processor (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14) for (i) receiving a request from a third party application which is different from the terminal application to use the peripheral device to present third party information to the user, (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14)(ii) determining if the request from the third party application should be fulfilled, (e.g., col., 7, lines 8 – col., 64); and (iii) using the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time to present the user with the third party information and thereby to fulfill the request (e.g., col., 14, lines 38 – col., 15, line 46).

17. Referring to claim 46, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

18. Referring to claim 47, RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. RAMACHANDRAN-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 2, lines 19 – col., 59, col., 4, line 60 – col., 5, line 14).

19. Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by De Leo et al., Electronic Data Systems Corporation, 6,381,626 (Hereinafter DeLeoElectronic).

20. Referring to claims 39, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses a method of operating a self-service terminal having a number of peripheral devices and a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48), the method comprising the steps of:

presenting to a self-service terminal user an option of accessing a third party application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48); receiving a request from the third party application to use one of the peripheral devices of the self-service terminal in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain the service from the third party application (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 – 51); using the terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party application should be granted (e.g., col., 7, lines 31 – 64); and activating the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third

party application when the request from the third party application to use the peripheral device is granted, and thereby to allow the user to obtain the service via the peripheral device (e.g., col., 8, lines 5 – 58).

21. Referring to claim 40, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DELEOELECTRONIC also discloses monitoring terminal usage during operation of the third party application to ensure that the user is still present (e.g., col., 7, lines 31 – 64).

22. Referring to claim 41, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DELEOELECTRONIC also discloses sending a response to the third party application to indicate the status of the request received from the third party application (e.g., col., 8, lines 5 – 58).

23. Referring to claim 42, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a peripheral device; a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices; and a controller (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48), for (i) receiving a request from a third party application to use the peripheral device in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48), (ii) using the terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party application should be granted (e.g., col., 7, lines 31 – 64); and (iii) activating the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the

peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time (e.g., col., 8, lines 5 – 58).

24. Referring to claim 43, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DELEOELECTRONIC also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a user input device (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48).

25. Referring to claim 44, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DELEOELECTRONIC also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48).

Referring to claim 45, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a cash dispenser for dispensing cash to a self-service terminal user conducting a self-service cash dispensing transaction (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48); a peripheral device for presenting information to the user; a memory storing a terminal application which controls the peripheral device; and a processor (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48) for (i) receiving a request from a third party application which is different from the terminal application to use the peripheral device to present third party information to the user (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48), (ii) determining if the request from the third party application should be fulfilled (e.g., col., 4, lines 8 – 51) and (iii) using the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time to present the user with the third party information and thereby to fulfill the request (e.g., col., 8, lines 5 – 58).

26. Referring to claim 46, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DELEOELECTRONIC also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48).

27. Referring to claim 47, DELEOELECTRONIC discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DELEOELECTRONIC also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., col., 3, lines 2 – 48).

28. Claims 39-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Drummond et al., 2001/0014881, Diebold Incorporated (Hereinafter Drummond-Diebold).

29. Referring to claims 39, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses a method of operating a self-service terminal having a number of peripheral devices and a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figures 3,12), the method comprising the steps of:

presenting to a self-service terminal user an option of accessing a third party application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal (paragraphs 55 – 59); receiving a request from the third party application to use one of the peripheral devices of the self-service terminal in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain the service from the third party application (e.g., paragraphs 58 – 60); using the terminal application to determine if the request received from the third party application

should be granted (e.g., paragraphs 61 – 63); and activating the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application when the request from the third party application to use the peripheral device is granted, and thereby to allow the user to obtain the service via the peripheral device (e.g., paragraphs 64 – 66).

30. Referring to claim 40, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD also discloses monitoring terminal usage during operation of the third party application to ensure that the user is still present (e.g., paragraphs 58 – 60).

31. Referring to claim 41, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD also discloses sending a response to the third party application to indicate the status of the request received from the third party application (e.g., paragraphs 58 – 60).

32. Referring to claim 42, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a peripheral device; a terminal application which controls the peripheral devices; and a controller (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figures 3,12) for (i) receiving a request from a third party application to use the peripheral device in response to the user accessing the third party application to obtain a service from the third party application while the user is at the self-service terminal (paragraphs 55 – 59); (ii) using the terminal application to determine if the request

received from the third party application should be granted (e.g., paragraphs 58 – 60); and (iii) activating the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time (e.g., paragraphs 64 – 66).

33. Referring to claim 43, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a user input device (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figures 3,12).

34. Referring to claim 44, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figures 3,12).

35. Referring to claim 45, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses a self-service terminal comprising: a cash dispenser for dispensing cash to a self-service terminal user conducting a self-service cash dispensing transaction (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figures 3, 12); a peripheral device for presenting information to the user; a memory storing a terminal application which controls the peripheral device; and a processor (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figures 3,12) for (i) receiving a request from a third party application which is different from the terminal application to use the peripheral device to present third party information to the user (paragraphs 55 – 59) (ii) determining if the request from the third party application should be fulfilled (e.g., paragraphs 58 – 60); and (iii) using the peripheral device under control of the terminal application such that

control of the peripheral device is not passed to the third party application at any time to present the user with the third party information and thereby to fulfill the request (e.g., paragraphs 64 – 66).

36. Referring to claim 46, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figure 3).

37. Referring to claim 47, DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. DRUMMOND-DIEBOLD also discloses wherein the peripheral device includes a display device (e.g., paragraphs 97 – 99, figure 3).

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Haresh Patel

March 16, 2007